

## SECTION II—REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for a thorough review, and respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application for the following reasons:

### **Claim objections**

The Office Action objected to claims 1, 14, 18 and 19 for informalities. In particular, claims 1, 14, 18 and 19 recite “attempting to ...” or similar language that is not “positively recited in such a way [as] to state a definite or concrete action of authenticating the user.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 14, 18, and 19 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite, “executing an authentication routine to authenticate the user device ... .” Claims 14, 18, and 19 have been amended in a similar manner. Applicants respectfully submit that “executing an authentication routine” positively states a definite and concrete action.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to claims 1, 14, 18, and 19.

### **Claims 1-16, 18-19 and 21-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-16, 18-19 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,127,524 to Renda et al. (“Renda”) in view of U.S. Patent 7,143,435 to Droms et al. (“Droms”). The Office Action concedes that Renda does not disclose a “user device connected with a blocked port of a packet forwarding device ... and sending an unblock port command to unblock[] the blocked port.” Refer to the Office Action at page 3, last

paragraph. However, the Office Action states that Droms discloses such a limitation. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Office Action relies on Droms at column 9, lines 45-65 which state in pertinent part: “In response to a **failed authentication**, the authenticator causes the switch **to block network traffic** with the host through the physical port 104b.” Causing a switch “**to block network traffic**” in response to a “**failed authentication**” is not the same as “sending an **unblock port command** ... when the authentication routine results in a **positive authentication response**.” Indeed, Droms provides functionality that is essentially opposite of the embodiment Applicants recite in claim 1, and thus does not disclose the limitation “sending an **unblock port command** ... when the authentication routine results in a **positive authentication response**.”

Furthermore, Droms teaches away from Applicants by describing the very method that Applicants disclose as being inadequate in the background section of the instant application. For example, paragraph [0008] states:

A drawback to prior art login procedures is that a user who plugs a computer into a network port **has immediate access to the network, although they may not necessarily have access to any of the resources on the network** (i.e. they have not yet successfully completed the login procedure).

Blocking a network port only “in response to a **failed authentication**” as disclosed by Droms leaves the network switch with a potentially inferior security defense in contrast to “sending an **unblock port command** to unblock the blocked port, when the authentication routine **results in a positive authentication response**,” as Applicants claim.

Because Renda and Droms, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every element in as complete detail as Applicants recite in independent claim 1, and because Droms teaches away from the embodiment Applicants recite in claim 1, Applicants

respectfully submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance and patentable over the references. Independent claim 18 recites a similar limitation. Dependent claims 2-16, 19 and 21-25 directly or indirectly incorporate all the limitations of the independent base claims upon which they depend, and thus, for at least the reasons stated above, are patentable over the references and in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to claims 1-16, 18-19 and 21-23 and allow new claims 24 and 25.

**New claims 24 and 25:**

As discussed above in reference to the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 24 and 25 are in condition for allowance as each directly or indirectly incorporates all the limitations of independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to allow new claims 24-25.

## **CONCLUSION**

Given the above amendments and accompanying remarks, all claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance. If the undersigned attorney has overlooked subject matter in any of the cited references that is relevant to allowance of the claims, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such subject matter may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (503) 439-8778.

### **Charge Deposit Account**

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fee(s) that may be due in this matter, and please credit the same deposit account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

/Gregory D. Caldwell/  
Gregory D. Caldwell  
Registration No. 39,926  
Attorney for Applicants

Date: December 18, 2007

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP  
1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
Telephone: (503) 439-8778  
Facsimile: (503) 439-6073